Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/770,289	SHIOTA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael J. Feely	1712
All Participants:	Status of Application: _	
(1) <u>Michael J. Feely</u> .	(3)	
(2) Corwin P. Umbach (Reg. No. 40,211).	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>17 September 2004</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appli Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	icant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: n/a		
Claims discussed: 12,13,14		
Prior art documents discussed: Rathi et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0089992 A1)		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	IERAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	AS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. T of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summ 	The examiner will provide a wri	tten summary of the substance e interview. since the interview
mill 9-6		
(Examiner/SPE/Signature) (Applica	nt/Applicant's Representative S	Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

A call was placed to Mr. Umbach to propose the cancellation of claims 12, 13, and 14. Newly discovered Rathi et al. read on the product-by-process claims. After consulting with his client, Mr. Umbach agreed to cancel claims 12, 13, and 14. It was also suggest to change "in" to "on" in the preamble of claim 1; however, Mr. Umbach indicated that his client was not willing to make this change. The preamble is inconsistent with the body of the claim; however, patentability lies in the body of the claim.